

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks responsive to the Office Action of September 11, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Office rejected claims 1-9 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Milleker and Murray. The Office further rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over AAPA in view of Milleker and Murray and further in view of Francis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections. Particularly, the Office asserted that essentially all of the steps recited in claim 1 are described in Applicant's background section and particularly on page 7, lines 1-15 and in steps 104-107 of Figure 1 except, in the step of building the resource, that the resource is built for containing the requested object, but not containing the requested object.

However, the Office said that this was found in Murray.

The present invention is an efficient method for exchanging data between two computer application programs or between a resource library and an application program. In accordance with a specific exemplary embodiment of the invention, XML documents for transporting the data between the two applications are built on-the-fly rather than being stored in memory. Further, when a resource library or application program receives a request for an object, the resource library creates the resource to which that object corresponds, but does not populate that resource. Next, the resource library populates the resource with only the object(s) requested. Then the resource is returned to the requesting application program.

This technique is to be contrasted with the prior art technique described in the background section of the present application at page 7, in which the resource repository calls a resource factory that uses a URI converter that takes the URI specified in the request and returns the contents of that URI. Next, the URI converter attempts to open the input stream from the document and return the resulting input stream. Assuming the stream has been successfully retrieved and converted, the receiving entity parses the input stream into the individual objects and writes the resource containing the objects to the cache. Finally, the particular one of the objects in the parsed document that was requested is located in the resource and returned to the tool. It is important to note that, in this routine, the entire XML document within which the requested object is contained is retrieved converted, parsed and written to the cache even though only a single object was requested.

The present invention is very different from the prior art described on page 7 of the present application and shown in the flow chart of Figure 1. In the AAPA, the resource factory does not create the resources on-the-fly, nor does it populate the resource with only the object requested. Rather, it stores fully populated resources in memory. It retrieves them when an object in that resource is requested and sends the entire resource to the requesting application program, even if only a single object in that resource was requested. This is wasteful and inefficient.

The present invention solves the aforementioned inefficiency of the AAPA and other problems.

While Applicant strongly disagrees with the Office's position that the AAPA in combination with Milleker and Murray renders the invention as claimed in the currently

pending claims obvious for the reasons set forth in the response to the previous Office Action, the Office expressly indicated that the claims would be allowable if the detailed functionality disclosed in Figure 2 and page 13, line 12 to page 14, line 8 of the specification were incorporated into the claims. This portion of the specification discusses the invention in the context of XML documents and Java class objects.

Applicant has herein amended the claims accordingly.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a Notice or Allowance at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned counsel by telephone call in order to further the prosecution of this case in any way.

Respectfully submitted,

December 7, 2006

/Theodore Naccarella/
Theodore Naccarella
Registration No. 33,023
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189
Attorney for Applicant

TXN:pmf

S:\IN\B\IBM RALEIGH RSW\PATENTS\IP24929 USA\PTO\RESPONSE TO 9-11-06 NONFINAL OFFICE ACTION.DOC